

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 5, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are submitted in response thereto. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Amendments have been made throughout the specification to provide proper identification and up-to-date status of copending applications mentioned therein.

The rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Cruickshank is respectfully traversed.

The present invention provides improved sharing of computer resources between users of two computers connected by an internetwork. Representative claim 1 recites a method wherein served resources residing in a first computer are shared between the first computer and a second computer. Call clients are run in each of the first and second computers for establishing a data call in response to a database of IP addresses. A request for sharing said served resources is generated within the first or second computer. A server application is run in the first computer for hosting the served resources. Client applications are run in the first and second computers for retrieving the served resources from the server application simultaneously.

The server application and the client application running in the second computer exchange network packets in response to the IP addresses used by the call clients. Thus, one important aspect of the claimed invention is that the resources to be shared include a server application, and these resources are accessed using a client application regardless of whether the served resources are being accessed by the user of the first computer or the second computer. In other words, the server running on the first computer could be streaming video data to client applications (e.g., media players) on both the first and second computers simultaneously, resulting in simplified and shared control of the shared resource between the two computer users.

In contrast, Criuckshank lacks these features and capabilities. A viable rejection for anticipation requires the cited reference to teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Criuckshank is deficient in that regard because even though it shares data between collaboration applications it lacks any teaching of and is incapable of sharing resources in the manner recited in claims 1, 8, and 11. Sharing documents or data in the manner of Criuckshank consumes substantially equal resources of each collaborating computer. As stated in column 5, lines 9-12, the “resident collaboration applications in personal computers 112 and 122 may be any compatible collaboration applications, although for optimum performance they should be identical applications.” Thus, the claimed arrangement of a server application for hosting served resources on the first computer and separate client applications on the first and second computers for retrieving the served resources is not taught by Criuckshank, and claims 1-16 are therefore allowable.

Claim 2 recites that the IP address used in the call client of the first computer is reported to the server application and that the server application sends a session initiation message to the client application running on the second computer. Claim 3 recites an alternative embodiment wherein the IP address used in the call client of the second computer is reported to the client application running in the second computer and wherein the client application running in the second computer sends a session initiation message to the server application. These claims each result in two separate data sessions between the computers, one for the data call similar to Criuckshank and one for sharing the server resources which is not present in Criuckshank. Claims 12 and 13 recite the same limitations. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 12, and 13 are separately patentable.

Claims 4-6, 9, 10, and 14-16 recite other aspects of the operation of the server application and are therefore separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, claims 1-16 are now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Mark L. Mollon", is written over a horizontal line.

Mark L. Mollon
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: January 3, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)